REMARKS

Consideration of the above amendments to the claims is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 12, and 71 have been amended to recite the alkylstyrene content being limited to not more than 20 wt%, and the m value is from less than 30.

Claim 23 was amended for clarity, as was claim 43.

Claim 81 has been amended to be within the ranges of the independent claim 71.

Claims 2-6, 13-17, 72-76, and 82 have been cancelled.

Objection to the Specification

Per paragraph 3 of the Attachment to the Advisory Action, this rejection appears to be withdrawn in light of Applicants arguments submitted on 1/17/2008.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Per paragraph 3 of the Attachment to the Advisory Action, this rejection appears to be withdrawn in light of Applicants' arguments submitted on 1/17/2008.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 71, and its dependant claims, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite in regards to the illustrated structure.

Applicants apologize for the failure to address this rejection in the prior response; this was not intentional.

Claim 71 has been amended to indicate that the structure being illustrated is the alkylstyrene monomer.

Rejections over Powers (US 5.162.445)

All pending claims, excluding claims 65 and 66, stand rejected, under one or more statute, over Powers.

In paragraph 4 of the Attachment to the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that if the same amendments to the claims, as presented in the 1/17/08 proposed amendment, were

U.S. Application No. 10/539,014 Attorney Docket No. 2003B133D US Response to Advisory Action of 2/13/08

presented in an enterable amendment, the amendments and arguments advanced by Applicant would overcome the rejections over Powers and the rejections would be withdrawn.

Applicants have duplicated the prior, non-entered amendments, and addressed the dependent claims to be consistent with the parent claims. Applicants' arguments regarding Powers are still applicable to the rejected claims and are hereby fully incorporated in this response. Thus, based on the amendments and arguments, Applicants believe all pending claims to be allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that the claims in this case are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

March 5, 2008 /Nancy T. Krawczyk/
Date Nancy T Krawczyk
Attorncy for Applicants
Registration No. 38,744

ExxonMobil Chemical Co. Law Technology P.O. Box 2149 Baytown, Texas 77522-2149 Phone: 281-834-2429

Fax: 281-834-2495